



**Educational Policies Council
Minutes of the Meeting
Monday, 16 September 2019**

Ex-Officio Members present (or represented): Interim Provost Melody J. Tankersley; Co-Chair Pamela E. Grimm; Deans Sonia A. Alemagno (represented by Tom Brewer), James L. Blank (represented by Mary Ann Haley), Barbara A. Broome, Kenneth J. Burhanna, John R. Crawford-Spinelli, James C. Hannon (represented by Alicia Crowe), Nathan Ritchey, Alison J. Smith, Deborah F. Spake, Cynthia R. Stillings; Associate Dean Babacar M'Baye

Ex-officio Members not present (or not represented): Deans Mark S. Mistur, Eboni J. Pringle, Amy L. Reynolds; Senior Associate Dean Vincent J. Hetherington; Associate Deans Cathy L. Dubois, Jocelyn Harrison, Miriam L. Matteson, Maureen McFarland, Stephen A. Mitchell, Kara L. Robinson, Wendy A. Umberger, William T. Willoughby

Faculty Senate-Appointed Representatives present (or represented): Professors Darci L. Kracht, Donald L. White; Associate Professors Jennifer M. Cunningham, Helen Piontkivska

Faculty Senate-Appointed Representatives not present (or not represented): Professors Edward Dauterich, Robert J. Twieg; Associate Professors Ann Abraham, Jeff Ciesla

Council Representatives present (or represented): Associate Professors Ivan Bernal, Jonathan F. Swoboda; Associate Lecturer Mary F. Kutchin

Council Representatives not present (or not represented): Dean Amy L. Reynolds; Professors Michael W. Chunn, Richard L. Mangrum, Christopher Rowan; Associate Professors Natalie Caine-Bish, Duane J. Ehredt, Nadia Greenhalgh-Stanley, Derek Kingsley, Jooyoun Park; Assistant Professors Lindsay C. Baran, Sara Bayramzadeh, Yafen Wang

Observers not present: Drake Wartman, Morgan Stilgenbauer

Consultants and Guests present: Aimee J. Bell, Alicia R. Crowe, Larry G. Froehlich, Mary Ann Haley, Jennifer S. Kellogg, Christa N. Ord, Gail M. Rebata, Hollie B. Simpson, Elizabeth A. Sinclair, Linnea C. Stafford, Therese E. Tillett, Marie Bukowski, Mike Fisch, Katherine Null

Interim Provost Melody J. Tankersley called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 19 August 2019, in room 319 of the Kent State Student Center.

Undergraduate EPC Action Item I: Report: Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method.

Associate Dean Alicia R. Crowe made a motion to approve and Dean Kenneth J. Burhanna seconded.

Dean Alison J. Smith presented on the URCC report and assessment of the Kent Core.

Presentation Topics

- Report and Recommendation on the Assessment of the Kent Core
 - Assessment report to the Higher Learning Commission
 - Recommendation for Revision of the Kent Core
- Kent Core Assessment
 - Currently assessed with 11 possible learning objectives and offered in 7 categories.
 - 11 Learning Objectives
 - Understand Basic Knowledge
 - Critical Thinking
 - Written Communication
 - Develop Creativity
 - Lifelong Learning
 - Responsible Use
 - Informed Citizens
 - Inclusion, Community, Tolerance
 - Ethics of Actions
 - Liberal Education
 - Quantitative Skills
 - 7 Categories
 - Composition
 - Math/Critical Reasoning
 - Humanities
 - Fine Arts
 - Social Sciences
 - Basic Sciences
 - Additional
 - Proposing to reduce 11 learning objectives to 4 broad learning outcomes.
 - Broad Learning Outcomes
 - Outcome 1: Community & Inclusion, Liberal Education
 - Outcome 2: Independent Thinking, Responsibility, Lifelong Learning
 - Outcome 3: Written/Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning
 - Outcome 4: Critical Thinking
 - Faculty Survey of Kent Core
 - Adjustments and updates needed—37%
 - New courses should be added—15%
 - No change needed—20%
 - Comment not applicable—26%
 - Rebuild of core needed—37%
 - Student Survey of Kent Core
 - Why did you choose specific Kent Core classes?
 - Interest—15%
 - Schedule Convenience—32%
 - Related to Major—11%
 - Only Interest and Major—15%
 - All These Reasons—27%
 - Perceptions that a conversation occurs about the Kent Core and the major

- Advisors: Strongly Agree—80%
 - Students: Strongly Agree—40%
- URCC Timeline Review of Kent Core
 - Fall 2017 to Fall 2018—Review began
 - Spring 2019—Submission report on Kent Core assessment
 - Fall 2019—Submission of plan to EPC
 - Fall 2021—Projected start of the plan

Discussion Topics

Co-Chair Grimm stated that this model would provide limited, but effective control of the Kent Core for faculty. It also has potential for departments.

Dean Smith added that rubrics for assessment will be downloadable. Department faculty can agree on which part they will use and they can create an instrument in relation to the course.

An EPC member expressed concern for the ability to assess the effectiveness of the entire Kent Core.

Dean Smith replied that students will take the Kent Core courses and when they come into their major, they will be assessed on a broad learning outcome chosen by the department. When students finish the program, in their senior year, they will be assessed again. Should see an improvement from the earlier years.

An EPC member expressed concern for assessment of Kent Core if student is being assessed only in major courses.

Dean Smith stated that the assessment is not on the Core alone, but on the ideal of the Kent State student and what we are bringing them in their total experience. The outcome should be seen throughout their major.

An EPC member asked what departments with Kent Core courses should do with their Kent Core courses in relation to this model.

Dean Smith responded that the model is assessing Kent Core courses on large concepts – outcomes. Additionally, feedback will be available for Kent Core offering departments. She explained that HLC wants to see the Kent Core tested as a whole rather than the courses.

An EPC member asked if the model will be used to help reshape the core?

Dean Smith replied, yes, over the years, members can expect there to be reshaping of the Kent Core. She explained that some Kent Core assessments are paired, but most are not. This model will help to assess and pair the Kent Core with the major courses.

An EPC member asked about the possibility of losing one class day from lower-level and upper-level courses.

Dean Smith replied that there should be a class day lost. She suggested the professors teaching the courses with the assessment discuss a rubric that allows an exercise that provides the assessment and relates to the course being taught.

An EPC member asked for clarification on reassessing the same outcome with students sophomore year and then senior year.

Dean Smith stated that the department will continue use the same assessment outcome. If and when they decide to use another outcome, they can do so. Therefore, the sophomore student will be assessed, no matter what, again in their senior year.

An EPC member stated that the assessment would need to be consistent since more than one professor will be teaching the courses within the department.

Plan is formed from the University of Cincinnati's assessment. They assess multiple experiences throughout a student's academic life and how they are integrative.

An EPC member expressed concern for the methods for separating the marginal impact of the core versus major classes.

Dean Smith replied that students would be measures three times—arrival, midway through and at the end. Response – measure three times.

A member asked about the possibility of students taking the assessment in two different courses.

Dean Smith replied that it would be happening at such a large scale that statistically, it will be okay. There may be people who will miss it entirely or people who take the assessment more than once. The model assessment is based on an overall performance. She explained that more models will be brought forward.

The item was passed with one no and one abstention.

With no requests for additional discussion, Interim Provost Tankersley adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Christa N. Ord
Administrative Secretary, Curriculum Services
Office of the Provost